United Nations E/AC.51/2017/L.4/Add.19

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: Limited
30 June 2017

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Fifty-seventh session
5-30 June 2017
Agenda item 7
Adoption of the report of the Committee on its fifty-seventh session

Draft report

Rapporteur: Mr. Rodrigo Otávio **Penteado Moraes** (Brazil)

Addendum

Programme questions: evaluation
(*Item 3 (b)*)

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees for 2017

1. At its 4th meeting, on 6 June 2017, the Committee considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the evaluation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) for 2017 (E/AC.51/2017/10).

2. The Under-Secretary-General for Internal Oversight Services introduced the report and, together with representatives of OIOS and UNHCR, responded to questions raised during its consideration by the Committee.

Discussion

3. Delegations expressed appreciation for the report of OIOS, with some voicing support for the recommendations made therein. Delegations also expressed appreciation for the work of UNHCR, which they noted was frequently carried out under very challenging circumstances, with external factors at play and in conjunction with partners. Delegations emphasized the importance of undertaking refugee registration in full coordination with host Governments and of registration for the effective delivery of assistance.

17-10893 (E) 030717

Please recycle

4. While highlighting the importance and complexity of registration of refugees and asylum seekers, delegations raised concerns regarding the quality of registration data and asked how the granularity of such data could be improved. The view was expressed that UNHCR should, in the light of the recommendations made in the report, enhance its results-based approach to monitoring and evaluation. Delegations asked how UNHCR built staff capacity in its geographically dispersed field operations. They also asked UNHCR to describe its progress in reducing registration timelines, in relation to paragraph 28 and figure XII of the report, and called for the streamlining of those timelines wherever circumstances permitted.

5. Clarification was sought with regard to the fact that, in the period under evaluation, UNHCR expenditure was consistently lower than income and needs (according to figures II and VIII), vacancy rates were high (according to figure IX) and registration was conducted at a relatively low staff level (according to para. 42). Delegations wished to know the reasons for those situations, whether UNHCR had difficulties in filling its positions and what solutions it might suggest to tackle the issues. Clarification was also sought on the needs-based approach to budgeting and whether it could potentially contribute to overbudgeting.

6. Delegations noted that OIOS had not delved deeply into all potential protection implications of registration or lack thereof, notably in relation to trafficking in persons, as mentioned in paragraph 30 of the report, and its new dimensions in situations of armed conflict. Some delegations objected to the reference in paragraph 21 of the report to lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex persons as a vulnerable population or "persons with specific needs", stressing that there was no consensus on the matter. Serious concern was raised over the carrying out of non-consensual activities and the use of non-consensual terms in reports submitted to the Committee. Some delegations noted that "lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender" was a term agreed upon in the United Nations, as evidenced by Human Rights Council resolutions 17/19, 27/32 and 32/2.

Conclusions and recommendations

7. **The Committee recommended that the General Assembly endorse the recommendations contained in paragraph 61 of the report of OIOS on the evaluation of UNHCR.**